3.    35 U.S.C. §103(a). The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Weschler et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,470,332), Hann et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,799,153), and Albrecht et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,950,011).

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claims 1, 10, and 19:

Claims 1, 10, and 19 appears as follows:

1.    A process for a simplified access control language that controls access to directory entries in a computer environment, comprising the steps of:
providing a user defined access control command attribute read list containing user identifications that are allowed to read a specified set of Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) attributes;
providing a system administrator defined read access control command;
wherein said read access control command resides in a directory containing said LDAP attributes;
said read access control command listing LDAP user attributes that said administrator has selected for user defined read access; and
said read access control command referring to said user defined read list at runtime thereby allowing said read user identifications read access to said LDAP user attributes.

10.    An apparatus for a simplified access control language that controls access to directory entries in a computer environment, comprising:
a user defined access control command attribute read list containing user identifications that are allowed to read a specified set of Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) attributes; and
a system administrator defined read access control command;
wherein said read access control command resides in a directory containing said LDAP attributes;
wherein said read access control command lists LDAP user attributes that said administrator has selected for user defined read access; and

2

wherein said read access control command refers to said user defined read list at runtime thereby allowing said read user identifications read access to said LDAP user attributes.

5   19.   A program storage medium readable by a computer, tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by the computer to perform method steps for a simplified access control language that controls access to directory entries in a computer environment, comprising the steps of:

   providing a user defined access control command attribute read list containing
10   user identifications that are allowed to read a specified set of Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) attributes;

   providing a system administrator defined read access control command;

   wherein said read access control command resides in a directory containing said LDAP attributes;

15   said read access control command listing LDAP user attributes that said administrator has selected for user defined read access;  and

   said read access control command referring to said user defined read list at runtime thereby allowing said read user identifications read access to said LDAP user attributes.

20

The Office Action states that Weschler teaches "... providing a user defined access control command attribute...' at col. 1, lines 55-59, col. 8, lines 56-59, and col. 7, lines 57-61." Weschler does not teach what the Office Action assumes. Weschler in col. 1, lines 55-59 states:

25

   "Each software application running on the client, or the client's operating system ("OS") may save client specific configuration data that is used by the client to fine-tune and define the user's software environment at runtime. "

30   This does not teach or disclose providing a **user defined** access control command attribute read list containing user identifications that are allowed to read a specified set of Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) attributes as claimed in the invention.  Further, although the claim element citation is out of context, the passage does not teach or disclose providing a user defined access control command as the Office Action states.  There is no
35   ability for a user to define a read list in an access control command mentioned or contemplated in this passage.  Therefore, Weschler in col. 1, lines 55-59 does not teach or

3

contemplate providing a **user defined** access control command attribute read list containing user identifications that are allowed to read a specified set of Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) attributes as claimed in the invention.

5  Col. 8, lines 56-59 state:

"As can be seen the queries are executed from the search root or can specify any profile as the search root. Specific attributes can be requested as a return value with access control being checked."

10

This citation must also be taken in context as a whole to interpret its meaning, otherwise there can not be any clear interpretation of the teaching of Weschler. Col. 8, lines 29-34 state:

15  "With reference additionally now to FIG. 3, a representative profile service search 300 presenting a series of three possible queries (Queries 1-3 inclusive) and the resultant matches is shown. The search 300 and all queries are executed relative to the search root 302 although a search may alternatively specify any profile as the search root."

20

Weschler is clearly teaching that queries can be made relative to a search root. There is no teaching or contemplation of an ability for a user to define a read list in an access control command in this passage. Therefore, Weschler in col. 8, lines 56-59 does not teach or contemplate providing a **user defined** access control command attribute read list containing
25  user identifications that are allowed to read a specified set of Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) attributes as claimed in the invention.

Col. 7, lines 57-61 state:

30  "API 203 provides an interface that enables client applications that have a corresponding interface to send messages that enable the application to send data and commands to request profile services from core profile engine 201."

Once again, Weschler teaches that requests for profile services can be made and **not**
35  providing a **user defined** access control command attribute read list containing user identifications that are allowed to read a specified set of Lightweight Directory Access

4

Protocol (LDAP) attributes as claimed in the invention. There is no teaching or contemplation of an ability for a user to define a read list in an access control command in this passage. Therefore, Weschler in col. 7, lines 57-61 does not teach or contemplate providing a **user defined** access control command attribute read list containing user
5    identifications that are allowed to read a specified set of Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) attributes as claimed in the invention.

Weschler therefore does not teach, disclose, or contemplate "... providing a user defined access control command attribute..." as the Office Action states.
10

The Office Action further states "'...a specified set of Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) attributes...' at col. 4, lines 61-63, and col. 8, lines 56-59." Once again, the claim element has been taken out of context. This is further demonstrated by col. 4, lines 61-63 which state:
15

> "Due to the fact that a full DAP client is difficult to implement on smaller computer systems, the LDAP, (Lightweight Directory Access Protocol) was developed."

This passage is part of a historical background of why DAP was developed. This **does**
20   **not** teach or disclose the claimed invention's element "providing a user defined access control command attribute read list containing user identifications that are allowed to read a specified set of Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) attributes" as claimed in the invention. The mere mention of LDAP does not disclose the claimed invention, nor does it give any motivation for one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to make the
25   claimed invention.

Therefore, Weschler in col. 4, lines 61-63 does not teach or contemplate providing a user defined access control command attribute read list containing user identifications that are allowed to read a specified set of Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) attributes
30   as claimed in the invention.

Col. 8, lines 56-59 state:

> "As can be seen the queries are executed from the search root or can specify any
35    profile as the search root. Specific attributes can be requested as a return value with access control being checked."

5

As noted above, this passage discusses that a query can be made relative to a search root. There is no teaching or disclosure of the claimed invention's element "providing a user defined access control command attribute read list containing user identifications that are allowed to read a specified set of Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) attributes".

Therefore, Weschler in col. 8, lines 56-59 does not teach or contemplate providing a user defined access control command attribute read list containing user identifications that are allowed to read a specified set of Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) attributes as claimed in the invention.

The Office Action further states "'...providing a system administrator defined...' at col. 2, lines 35-37, and col. 1, lines 55-59." Once again, the claim element has been taken out of context. Col. 2, lines 35-37 state:

"The user or system administrator must manually track the location and content of each configuration file."

This passage is again background information and simply states that manual tracking of configuration files had to be performed in previous systems. This has nothing to do with the claimed invention. The claimed invention's element is "providing a system administrator defined read access control command". This passage has nothing to do with a read access control command, nor does it have anything to do with providing a system administrator defined read access control command. Therefore, Weschler in col. 2, lines 35-37 does not teach or contemplate providing a system administrator defined read access control command as claimed in the invention.

Col. 1, lines 55-59 state:

"Each software application running on the client, or the client's operating system ("OS") may save client specific configuration data that is used by the client to fine-tune and define the user's software environment at runtime. "

Once again, this passage has nothing to do with the claimed invention. It states that specific configuration data may be saved that is used by the client to fine-tune and define the user's software environment at runtime. It does not teach what the Office Action states. It further

6

does not teach or contemplate the claimed invention's element of "providing a system administrator defined read access control command". Therefore, Weschler in col. 1, lines 55-59 does not teach or contemplate providing a system administrator defined read access control command as claimed in the invention.

5

The Office Action further states "'...read access control command...' at col. 8, lines 1-9, col. 8, lines 56-59, and col. 7, lines 56-59." Again, the claim element has been taken out of context. Col. 8, lines 1-9 state:

10

"Core profile engine 201 responds to the client application requests by executing requested functions on virtual profile data store 205. Core profile engine 201 maintains a set of metadata about every attribute and binding for every profile. This metadata controls how the profile engine 201 makes the profile data available to client applications 202. This metadata includes, but is not limited to, information regarding owner identity, read-write-modify permissions, group membership, timestamps, triggers, and the like."

15

This passage makes no mention of a "...read access control command..." as the Office Action states. It merely mentions that metadata exists that controls how the profile engine makes the profile data available to client applications. It does not teach or contemplate that claimed invention's element of "providing a system administrator defined read access control command". Therefore, Weschler in col. 8, lines 1-9 does not teach or contemplate providing a system administrator defined read access control command as claimed in the invention.

20

25

Col. 8, lines 56-59 state:

"As can be seen the queries are executed from the search root or can specify any profile as the search root. Specific attributes can be requested as a return value with access control being checked."

30

As noted above, this passage discusses that a query can be made relative to a search root. This passage makes no mention of a "...read access control command..." as the Office Action states. There is no teaching or disclosure of the claimed invention's element "providing a system administrator defined read access control command". Therefore,

35

7

Weschler in col. 8, lines 56-59 does not teach or contemplate providing a system administrator defined read access control command as claimed in the invention.

Col. 7, lines 56-59 state:

5

"a client application 202 through a profile services application programming interface ("API") 203. API 203 provides an interface that enables client applications that have a corresponding interface to send messages that enable the application to send data and commands to request profile"

10

Applicant is unclear why this passage was cited because it is incomplete. However, it does not teach or contemplate what the Office Action states. This passage makes no mention of a "...read access control command..." as the Office Action states. There is no teaching or disclosure of the claimed invention's element "providing a system administrator

15 defined read access control command". Therefore, Weschler in col. 7, lines 56-59 does not teach or contemplate providing a system administrator defined read access control command as claimed in the invention.

The Office Action further states "'...wherein said read access control command...' at col. 8,

20 lines 1-9, col. 8, lines 56-59, and col. 7, lines 56-59." Again, the claim element has been taken out of context. As discussed above, Weschler in col. 8, lines 1-9, col. 8, lines 56-59, and col. 7, lines 56-59 does not teach or contemplate the invention. These passages make no mention of "...wherein said read access control command..." as the Office Action states. There is no teaching or disclosure of the claimed invention's element "wherein said read

25 access control command resides in a directory containing said LDAP attributes". Therefore, Weschler in col. 8, lines 1-9, col. 8, lines 56-59, and col. 7, lines 56-59 does not teach or contemplate wherein said read access control command resides in a directory containing said LDAP attributes as claimed in the invention.

30 The Office Action further states "'...resides in a directory containing said LDAP attributes...' at col. 8, lines 10-15, col. 8, lines 56-59, and col. 7, lines 56-59." Again, the claim element has been taken out of context. Col. 8, lines 10-15 state:

"Virtual profile data store 205 may comprise a single data storage device, but more

35 often comprises a plurality of disparate, heterogeneous data storage devices. The specific example of FIG. 2 includes a relational database 206, lightweight directory

8

access protocol 207, flat data file 208, object oriented database 209, and X.500 directory 211."

5     This passage makes no mention of "...resides in a directory containing said LDAP attributes..." as the Office Action states.

As discussed above, Weschler in col. 8, lines 56-59, and col. 7, lines 56-59 does not teach or contemplate the invention. These passages make no mention of "...resides in a directory containing said LDAP attributes..." as the Office Action states. There is no
10    teaching or disclosure of the claimed invention's element "wherein said read access control command resides in a directory containing said LDAP attributes". Therefore, Weschler in col. 8, lines 10-15, col. 8, lines 56-59, and col. 7, lines 56-59 does not teach or contemplate wherein said read access control command resides in a directory containing said LDAP attributes as claimed in the invention.

15    The Office Action further states "'... said read access control command...' at col. 8, lines 1-9, col. 8, lines 56-59, and col. 7, lines 56-59." Again, the claim element has been taken out of context. As discussed above, Weschler in col. 8, lines 1-9, col. 8, lines 56-59, and col. 7, lines 56-59 does not teach or contemplate the invention. These passages make no
20    mention of "...said read access control command..." as the Office Action states. There is no teaching or disclosure of the claimed invention's element "said read access control command listing LDAP user attributes that said administrator has selected for user defined read access". Therefore, Weschler in col. 8, lines 1-9, col. 8, lines 56-59, and col. 7, lines 56-59 does not teach or contemplate said read access control command listing LDAP user
25    attributes that said administrator has selected for user defined read access as claimed in the invention.

The Office Action further states "'...listing LDAP user attributes...' at col. 8, lines 56-59, and col. 7, lines 56-59." Again, the claim element has been taken out of context. As discussed
30    above, Weschler in col. 8, lines 56-59, and col. 7, lines 56-59 does not teach or contemplate the invention. These passages make no mention of "...listing LDAP user attributes..." as the Office Action states. There is no teaching or disclosure of the claimed invention's element "said read access control command listing LDAP user attributes that said administrator has selected for user defined read access". Therefore, Weschler in col. 8, lines
35    56-59, and col. 7, lines 56-59 does not teach or contemplate said read access control

9

command listing LDAP user attributes that said administrator has selected for user defined read access as claimed in the invention.

5    The Office Action further states "'...that said administrator has selected...' at col. 2, lines 35-37, and col. 1, lines 55-59." Again, the claim element has been taken out of context. As discussed above, Weschler in col. 2, lines 35-37, and col. 1, lines 55-59 does not teach or contemplate the invention. These passages make no mention of "...that said administrator has selected..." as the Office Action states. There is no teaching or disclosure of the claimed invention's element "said read access control command listing LDAP user attributes
10    that said administrator has selected for user defined read access". Therefore, Weschler in col. 2, lines 35-37, and col. 1, lines 55-59 does not teach or contemplate said read access control command listing LDAP user attributes that said administrator has selected for user defined read access as claimed in the invention.

15    The Office Action further states "'...for user defined read access...' at col. 1, lines 55-59, col. 8, lines 1-9, and col. 8, lines 56-59." Again, the claim element has been taken out of context. As discussed above, Weschler in col. 1, lines 55-59, col. 8, lines 1-9, and col. 8, lines 56-59 does not teach or contemplate the invention. These passages make no mention of "...for user defined read access..." as the Office Action states. There is no
20    teaching or disclosure of the claimed invention's element "said read access control command listing LDAP user attributes that said administrator has selected for user defined read access". Therefore, Weschler in col. 1, lines 55-59, col. 8, lines 1-9, and col. 8, lines 56-59 does not teach or contemplate said read access control command listing LDAP user attributes that said administrator has selected for user defined read access as claimed in the
25    invention.

The Office Action further states "'... and said read access control command...' at col. 8, lines 1-9, col. 8, lines 56-59, and col. 7, lines 56-59." Again, the claim element has been taken out of context. As discussed above, Weschler in col. 8, lines 1-9, col. 8, lines 56-59, and
30    col. 7, lines 56-59 does not teach or contemplate the invention. These passages make no mention of "...and said read access control command..." as the Office Action states. There is no teaching or disclosure of the claimed invention's element "said read access control command referring to said user defined read list at runtime thereby allowing said read user identifications read access to said LDAP user attributes". Therefore, Weschler in col. 8, lines
35    1-9, col. 8, lines 56-59, and col. 7, lines 56-59 does not teach or contemplate said read access control command referring to said user defined read list at runtime thereby allowing

10

said read user identifications read access to said LDAP user attributes as claimed in the invention.

5    The Office Action further states "...referring to said user defined...' at col. 1, lines 55-59." Again, the claim element has been taken out of context. As discussed above, Weschler in col. 1, lines 55-59 does not teach or contemplate the invention. The passage makes no mention of "...referring to said user defined..." as the Office Action states. There is no teaching or disclosure of the claimed invention's element "said read access control command referring to said **user defined** read list at runtime thereby allowing said read user

10   identifications read access to said LDAP user attributes". Therefore, Weschler in col. 1, lines 55-59, col. 8, lines 1-9, and col. 8, lines 56-59 does not teach or contemplate said read access control command referring to said **user defined** read list at runtime thereby allowing said read user identifications read access to said LDAP user attributes as claimed in the invention.

15

The Office Action's parsing of the claimed elements is out of context. Such parsing can only be attributed to information gleaned from the present invention, Such use of hindsight is impermissible.

20   In response to the Examiner's response to the Applicant's hindsight argument in previous Office Actions, Applicant points to *Ex Parte Levengood*, 22 USPQ 2D 1300, 1301-02 (B.P.A.I. 1993):

25   "Accordingly, an examiner cannot establish obviousness by locating references which describe various aspects of a patent applicant's invention without also providing evidence of the motivating force which would impel one skilled in the art to do what the patent application has done."

30   Therefore, Weschler, Hann, and Albrecht do not teach or disclose the invention as claimed.

Claims 1, 10, and 19 are in allowable condition. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claims 5, 14, and 23:

35

11

The rejection of Claims 5, 14, and 23 is deemed moot in view of Applicant's remarks regarding Claims 1, 10, and 19, above. Claims 5, 14, and 23 are dependent upon independent Claims 1, 10, and 19, respectively, which are in allowable condition. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35

5    U.S.C. §103(a).

Claims 6, 15, and 24:

10   As with Claims 1, 10, and 19, above, neither Weschler, Hann, nor Albrecht, teach, describe, or contemplate the claimed invention.

Therefore, Weschler, Hann, and Albrecht do not teach or disclose the invention as claimed.

Claims 6, 15, and 24 are in allowable condition. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests
15   that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claims 2, 11, and 20:

The rejection of Claims 2, 11, and 20 is deemed moot in view of Applicant's remarks
20   regarding Claims 1, 10, and 19, above. Claims 2, 11, and 20 are dependent upon independent Claims 1, 10, and 19, respectively, which are in allowable condition. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

25   Claims 3, 12, and 21:

The rejection of Claims 3, 12, and 21 is deemed moot in view of Applicant's remarks regarding Claims 1, 10, and 19, above. Claims 3, 12, and 21 are dependent upon independent Claims 1, 10, and 19, respectively, which are in allowable condition.
30   Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claims 4, 13, and 22:

35   The rejection of Claims 4, 13, and 22 is deemed moot in view of Applicant's remarks regarding Claims 1, 10, and 19, above. Claims 4, 13, and 22 are dependent upon

12

independent Claims 1, 10, and 19, respectively, which are in allowable condition. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

5     Claims 7, 16, and 25:

The rejection of Claims 7, 16, and 25 is deemed moot in view of Applicant's remarks regarding Claims 6, 15, and 24, above. Claims 7, 16, and 25 are dependent upon independent Claims 6, 15, and 24, respectively, which are in allowable condition. 10   Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claims 8, 17, and 26:

15   The rejection of Claims 8, 17, and 26 is deemed moot in view of Applicant's remarks regarding Claims 6, 15, and 24, above. Claims 8, 17, and 26 are dependent upon independent Claims 6, 15, and 24, respectively, which are in allowable condition. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).
20

Claims 9, 18, and 27:

The rejection of Claims 9, 18, and 27 is deemed moot in view of Applicant's remarks regarding Claims 6, 15, and 24, above. Claims 9, 18, and 27 are dependent upon 25   independent Claims 6, 15, and 24, respectively, which are in allowable condition. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

13